**RPM Activities Planned for 2011 – 2012**

**Clark College**

**Given your project progress to date (as described in your end-of-year report), summarize how you will be continuing and extending the work in the coming year as we come to the official end of the grant:**

* **Describe the major activities/interventions being implemented in 2011-12, including what’s being done, who’s involved, the expected outcomes, and what evidence will you gather to assess the effectiveness of the specific interventions—in particular, describe any plans aimed at supporting shifts in individual teaching practices, strengthening focused collaborative inquiry among groups of faculty, and building a stronger department culture to support reflective teaching**
* **What will you be doing this year to increase the likelihood that the work done through the grant will be sustained beyond the immediate grant funding?**

RPM activities at Clark College for 2011-2012 will include the following:

* Build and enhance department participation & institutional awareness of RPM activities
* Improve the quality of inquiry in the FIGs
* Make classroom exchanges more numerous and effective
* Collaborate across the state, & within departments at Clark, on improving our work
* Work with the math department implement a fast-track pilot (STAT-WAY for 2013-14)
* Investigate future sources of funding through Clark College

**Build and enhance department participation & institutional awareness**

This year we plan to increase the number of participants in RPM activities. This will be done through two venues, FIG activities and Reflection Fridays. We will be offering more FIGs for instructors in the fall due to the growth in the number of teachers who can lead FIGs. We now have 12 instructors who have expressed interest in being a FIG leader due to their previous participation in FIGs. We intend to have 8 or more FIGs meeting during each term with 50 or more faculty involved each term. We also hope to have several tenured faculty participating. We have a FIG tracking form that identifies the number of faculty participating in each meeting as well as the number and type of activities conducted by the participants prior to that meeting. These forms are submitted electronically to the Clark RPM leadership and will be used summarize the degree of participation and types of activities during the year.

Reflection Fridays will be a bi-weekly event in the afternoon that will feature a variety of topics that are relevant at that point of the term. We plan to start with an inquiry into the implementation and effectiveness of “number play” in our pre-college math courses. This is one of the featured themes of Ruth Parker’s presentations prior to the term. We hope to get at least 10 faculty participating in each “Reflection Friday”. We will track the number of faculty who participate in these meetings as well as summarize what is done. This will be used to track the success of this aspect of our work.

We plan to use Ruth Parker’s visit as an opportunity to recruit teachers and gain greater exposure to Clark College administrators. A discussion of the RPM work will be incorporated into Ruth’s presentation with a faculty reflection activity during the last half hour of the presentation. At the conclusion of the event we will have FIG sign-ups, and announce the “Reflection Fridays” activities as venues to discuss the implementation and implications of using “number talks” in classes. We will be inviting our STEM Dean, Peter Williams, as well as inviting all math instructors, including personal invitations to tenured faculty.

**Improve the quality of inquiry in the FIGs**

We will develop and use protocols for use within FIG meetings. These will be focused on the aspects of effective communication and collaboration. This will keep the energy focused on inquiry about student learning and conceptual understanding. Last year much time was spent on what the teachers did in the classroom rather than what the students were doing.

Student work will be used as a basis for generating discussions about what the students know and what misconceptions they have. We believe this will promote a positive “What are they understanding?” point of view in our practice of examining student work. Our current plans are to use the rubric/protocol presented by Mickey at the summer institute but may make modifications. Teachers will use the student work to establish interventions that will be used in the classroom with follow-up discussions on the effectiveness of these responses in the next FIG meeting. Training for effective intervention techniques will be a key component in furthering the effectiveness of our interventions. We hope that Mickey, Emily or Gilles can provide some help during the year. We will track our progress on this task using the FIG tracking forms that are completed each meeting. These forms will include a response item outlining the degree to which teachers behavior changes in the FIG meetings and classrooms.

**Make classroom exchanges more numerous and effective**

Last year, teaching schedule conflicts limited the number of classroom exchanges. This was due to the fact that classroom exchanges occurred between members of a particular FIG who often taught at the same time. This year we will be setting up a calendar for all FIG members indicating teaching schedule and hours available for classroom exchanges for each instructor. As a result, a teacher will be able to find someone to pair up with.

We will offer training in how to observe a class by having a training session where we observe a lesson that has been videotaped. We did this last year with our first FIG and it really helped us adjust our focus from the teacher and the lesson content to the students and their learning behaviors. This training was facilitated by Sue Bluestein from ESD 112 and we will invite her to do this again in 2011-12. We also plan to make videos of our own lessons and use these as a way to examine student learning in our FIGs.

We will include a requirement that instructors schedule time to have a pre and post classroom exchange meeting. These were optional in the past as schedules are tight and often interrupted. However, the pre and post meetings are so valuable we must make sure these occur.

**Work collaboratively across the state and within departments at Clark College**

Two of our initiatives will be better served if we collaborate with colleagues working on similar tasks around the state. The tasks include the work on student attributes and course specific assessments of math concepts.

Our work with student attributes concerns measuring progress over time and imbedding these attributes into the curriculum. Last year we piloted a student attributes survey intended to measure progress. Our results indicate that we need to re-think the content of the survey. We plan to contact colleagues at other RPM colleges who are working on the same task to see if we can learn more about developing an effective survey instrument. Beyond this, we hope that a set of common survey questions/items will be developed so any or all colleges could ask a set of common questions. To date, our work with imbedding attributes has not begun. We are planning to test one or two instruments this fall in some classes but we are in the pilot phase of this task and would like to share ideas with those working on imbedding student attributes into class activities and lesson designs.

Last year we developed a set of course-specific “concept tests” that are designed to measure student understanding of concepts that are relevant to a particular pre-college math course. Each course has one “concept test” and we plan to share these with interested colleagues across the state for discussion and further development. At Clark, we are going to ask the math department to include a set of “concept test” questions into every final exam for each course in the pre-college math curriculum. The questions would be the same for each course but would vary between courses. This would allow us to measure conceptual understanding of these concepts across the pre-college math curriculum and provide a basis for tracking improvements in these understandings.

**Work with the Math Department to implement a fast-track pilot (STAT-WAY 2013-14)**

We will introduce STAT-WAY and its purpose at the department meeting before the beginning of fall term. The math department will be invited to work with RPM instructors to investigate the feasibility of establishing a STAT-WAY course (two terms) using the work done by the Carnagie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. A committee, including tenured math instructors, will review the learning objectives and lessons for STATWAY to determine if the learning objectives and content are acceptable as a substitute for intermediate algebra and the statistics curriculum at Clark. The committee will report their findings to the department.

If the findings are favorable and the department approves, we will move forward with investigating what needs to be done to begin offering STAT-WAY courses in 2013-14. We will need to check with a number of entities at Clark to assure no problems arise if STAT-WAY is implemented. These entities include but are not limited to the Financial Aid Office, the Registration Office and the Curriculum Committee.

**Investigate future funding through Clark College**

Our plan is to have most of our future funding devoted to paying adjunct faculty for participation in the FIGs. We believe that this is the strongest selling point to the administration for getting dollars from Clark College sources. By demonstrating the growth, enthusiasm and clarity of purpose of this project we think we can gain support. Clark College has spent money on adjunct professional development in the past and we hope to expand on that attitude. We have a committee of several RPM members who are (or will be) in contact with administrators as well as our foundation investigating funding sources and opportunities. Through these efforts we will determine the funding options available to us.

Beyond the need to support adjuncts, most of our work will not be greatly impacted by loss of funds. Our core team considers this work as beneficial to professional experience and will continue without funding. Our analysis of student success is supported by the Office of Planning and Effectiveness and is provided through the school and will continue without grant related dollars.

**Core Team Members at Clark College:** The following faculty comprise the “core team” for the RPM project at Clark College. These members engage directly in the planning and implementation of the RPM activities. Many other faculty play vital roles in our FIGs and are not included in this list.

Bill Monroe, Math Division, [bmonroe@clark.edu](mailto:bmonroe@clark.edu)

Carren Walker, Math Division, [cwalker@clark.edu](mailto:cwalker@clark.edu)

Jody McQuillan, Adult Basic Education, [jmquillan@clark.edu](mailto:jmquillan@clark.edu)

Luanne Lundberg, Developmental Education, [llundberg@clark.edu](mailto:llundberg@clark.edu)

Gary Phillips, Developmental Education, [gphillips@clark.edu](mailto:gphillips@clark.edu)

Bob Lynn, Math Division – Developmental Education, [rlynn@clark.edu](mailto:rlynn@clark.edu)

Gail Liberman, retired Clark instructor, [gliberman@clark.edu](mailto:gliberman@clark.edu)

Joan Zoellner, Math Division, [jzoellner@clark.edu](mailto:jzoellner@clark.edu)

Diana Coatney, Math Division, [dcoatney@clark.edu](mailto:dcoatney@clark.edu)

Isaac Erskine, Math Division, [ierskine@clark.edu](mailto:ierskine@clark.edu)

Bryan James, Math Division, [bjames@clark.edu](mailto:bjames@clark.edu)

Cynthia Foreman, e-learning, [cforemant@clark.edu](mailto:cforemant@clark.edu)